

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the office action dated April 15, 2008.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-23 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Specifically, the examiner has stated that the limitation of

“acquiring, by communication between a second-network print system component and said local print system component, printer data for a plurality of second-network printers located in a second network wherein said plurality of second-network printers are not directly accessible to said local print system component”

is not supported in the specification and figures.

Figures 1a, 1b, 1c and 2-9 all show a local print system component and a remote print system component. In these figures, the local print system component resides in a first LAN or network and the remote print system component resided in a second LAN or network. All these figures show communication arrows 14, 54, 85 and others representing communication between the local (first) print system component and the remote (second) print system component.

This claim element is also described in paragraph [0048] of the specification, which describes, in relation to Figures 1a-1c, print system components 2, 4 that are located in separate LANs 8, 10. These print system components communicate 14 to enable access to local devices 20.

Paragraphs [0049] – [0051] also describe embodiments comprising this claim element that are used in conjunction with a local address book, a DNS server and a domain site, respectively.

Paragraph [0065] also describes a local spooler 120 that establishes bi-directional communication with a remote spooler 122. These spoolers are shown in Figure 5 as being in a local and remote location. Remote spooler 122 queries its local devices (e.g., printers) for availability and capability and identifies printers and their capabilities to the local spooler 120.

Paragraph [0073] also describes a local print processor 194 that established bi-directional communication with a remote spooler 192 or remote print processor 196, which queries printers that are capable of a print task. The remote spooler 192 or print processor 196 then responds by querying printers in its network. Capable printers are then reported back to the local print processor 194.

Applicant submits that one skilled-in-the-art can equate a first and second network described in the claims with the local and remote networks in the specification.

Many other locations in the specification also describe the claim element rejected in the present Office Action. Accordingly, these claim elements are well described in the specification and comply with the written description requirement of 35 USC §112.

Based on the foregoing remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott C. Krieger/

Scott C. Krieger
Reg. No. 42,768
Tel. No.: (360) 828-0589